

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 16, 2002 LB 1185

SENATOR BROMM: You know, I'm not sure where your definition is coming from, but I can see that that would be a horticultural product.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so it has nothing to do with the market or the lucrateness of the business, it's just if it's ag it's different.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: Well, I don't have dollar figures in here on the lucrative of the business, no more than I think the courts should say if you buy your feed by the semi load you're no longer a farmer. I mean that makes no sense. That's not in the law. If we want to put that in the law, then that's fine. If we want to put a dollar value test, that would be another standard and I think there may be a state or two that do that, but...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you, Senator.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Beutler, your light is on next. He waives. Senator Beutler, you're recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Kristensen, members of the Legislature, the amendment that I'm proposing to you now is to exempt out of the definition of agricultural pursuits those businesses that are producing products that are primarily for urban ornamental or garden use. Again, the thought is that there is no particular reason why these types of businesses should be exempted under the law from providing their workers with workers' compensation. And if we're going to start including all of these peripheral kinds of businesses and lucrative kinds of businesses, then I see no rationale whatsoever for this bill. All we're doing is backing away from a commitment to people who need help the most. There is no reason why we should be giving huge subsidies to the employers and then not even giving basic protection to employees who are helping those employers; basic protections that are afforded everybody else in the workplace. So all this amendment does is